

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 24 – 27, 32-35 and 37-44 are pending in the instant application and stand rejected on various grounds. Claims 28 - 31, 36, and 45 - 54 have been cancelled.

II. Claim Objections

The Office Action identified an objection to claim 24 regarding the term ATPG/scan fail translator. The claim has been amended to reflect the proper antecedent “ATPG tool.” Claim 39 was also objected to and has been amended to overcome the objection. These claims are believed to be in condition for appeal.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. §103

The Office Action identified a final rejection based on the combination of Smith and Testa. Specifically, the Examiner represents in the final office action that “Smith performs a diagnosis step wherein a list of failed scan chains is displayed (column 4, lines 35 – 42) on a display device (see also Fig. 10).” In fact, the columns cited by the Examiner do not describe any display of scan chains whatsoever. To quote:

“The diagnosis step produces a diagnostic list of suspected failing nets. This information is processed together with design information to identify X,Y defect locations.”

The Applicant has painstakingly reviewed Smith and can still find no suggestion whatsoever of displaying failed scan chains as claimed. Smith takes a list of failed scan chains to generate physical X-Y locations. He does not display the failed scan chains (the logic function blocks) because he’s more interested in the physical X-Y data (the specific transistor locations of the failures). Moreover, the Examiner has yet to identify the motivation in Smith to incorporate the GUI of Testa, and vice versa.

While the Applicant would greatly appreciate reconsideration of the claim rejections, a Notice of Appeal is attached hereto irregardless.

Respectfully Submitted,



Lance M. Kreisman

Reg. 39,256

Attorney for Applicants

Atty. Docket: 1542-US

phone: (818) 874-7026

fax: (818) 874-5626